

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (US 6,335,276).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in further view of Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in further view of Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 10 and 12 to further define the invention. No new matter is being added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (US 6,335,276). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display device including, in part, "... forming a first insulating layer, a second insulating layer, an active layer, and a second metal layer on the substrate;... forming a plurality of first photoresist portions, a plurality of second photoresist portions, and a plurality of third photoresist portions,

wherein the first photoresist portions correspond to portions of a thin film transistor, the data line, the second capacitor electrode, the second photoresist portions correspond to portions of the gate pad, portions of the data pad, portions of the second capacitor electrode, the third photoresist portions correspond to a pixel region, portions of the gate pad, portions of the source electrode, portions of the drain electrode;... ." Park et al. (US 6,335,276) does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-6, 8-13, 15 and 16, which depend therefrom, are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in further view of Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claim 7 depends from dependent claim 6 and includes all of the elements of independent claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276). Applicants submit that neither Kim (US 6,255,130) nor Park et al. (US 6,287,899) cures the deficiencies of Park et al. (US 6,335,276) with respect to claim 1 as identified above, and that Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899) analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 7 indirectly depending therefrom are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276), Kim (US 6,255,130) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) in further view of Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claim 14 depends from independent claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276). Applicants submit that Park et al. (US 6,287,899) does not cure the deficiencies of Park et al. (US 6,335,276) with respect to claim 1 as identified above, and that Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899) analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 14 depending therefrom are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276) and Park et al. (US 6,287,899).

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276).

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claim 17 depends from independent claim 1 and includes all of the elements of claim 1. As Applicants have discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claim 17 depending therefrom are allowable over Park et al. (US 6,335,276).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-17 are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: June 11, 2008

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 739-3000